REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1, 4, and 6-11 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 11 are independent. Claims 7 and 8 have been canceled by this reply. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1.

Claim Amendments

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include the limitations of dependent claims 7 and 8. Accordingly, claims 7 and 8 have been canceled by this reply. Further, independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, to clarify that the duration of validity is determined based on a content of the updated information, indicating that examination of the updated information occurs before the assigning of an expiration (*see* Office Action mailed October 23, 2006, page 2). Applicant asserts no new subject matter is added by way of these amendments. Support for these amendments may be found, for example, on pages 6-7 of the Specification.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, and 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,745,368 ("Boucher") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,374,404 ("Brotz"), and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,629,138 ("Lambert"). Claims 7 and 8 have been canceled by this reply, thus this rejection is now moot with respect to claims 7 and 8. To the extent that this

rejection may still apply to the remaining amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The independent claims have been amended to recite that the duration of validity is affixed based on a content of the updated information. From the amended language recited in the independent claims, it is clear that the updated information must be examined before the duration of validity is affixed based on the content of the updated information.

Turning to the rejection of the claims, the Examiner admits that Boucher and Brotz fail to disclose or suggest affixing at least one portion of the updated information with a duration of validity that is a period of time during which the updated information is valid, and wherein the duration of validity is determined based on a type of information (*see* Office Action mailed October 23, 2006, page 5). The Examiner relies on Lambert as disclosing the aforementioned limitations of the claimed invention.

The cited portion of Lambert recites that a caching server assigns each piece of content an expiration date (*see* Lambert, col. 32, ll. 3-5). However, Lambert fails to disclose or suggest that before assigning the content an expiration date, the content is examined to determine how far out the expiration date should be. Rather, Lambert only discloses that the expiration date assigned to particular content can be inferred based on knowledge of the content (*see* Lambert, col. 32, ll. 7-10). Estimating the expiration of content based on knowledge of the content *after* the content has already been assigned an expiration is completely distinct from assigning an expiration based on the type of content contained within the updated information (*i.e.,* where the examination of the content occurs *before* the assigning of the expiration), as now clearly recited by the amended independent claims.

Furthermore, none of Boucher, Brotz, or Lambert disclose at least the limitations "wherein an identifier is affixed to the updated information when it is stored in the cache memory, and wherein the identifier associated with the updated information is based on the content of the updated information." The Examiner cites column 6, lines 49-54 and column 10, lines 1-3 of Boucher as disclosing the aforementioned limitations of the amended independent claims (see Office Action mailed October 23, 2006, page 6). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The cited portions of Boucher disclose a first and second data object type that include pre-rendered multimedia content data (*see* Boucher, col. 6, ll. 49-54). Further, the cited portion of Boucher discloses "by retrieving only outdated portions some savings can be gained in the rendering step by eliminating the need for a full rendering" (*see* Boucher, col. 10, ll. 1-3). A data object type is completely distinct from an identifier. An identifier, as one skilled in the art will appreciate, is a lexical token that names entities. Naming entities makes it possible to refer to them, which is essential for any type of symbolic processing. However, the data object types disclosed in Boucher are individual units of run-time data storage that are used as the basic building blocks of object-oriented programs. Each data object type can be viewed as an independent entity with its own functionality. An identifier is not an object which contains its own functionality. Rather, an identifier simply names another entity.

In the claimed invention, updated information is affixed with an identifier based on the content of the updated information. This identifier is used to refer to the updated information. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that the data object type disclosed in Boucher is an identifier, the data object type is not assigned based on the content of the pre-rendered multimedia content disclosed in Boucher. Rather, the cited portion of Boucher only discloses that outdated portions are retrieved, saving the need for a full rendering. No content is examined in Boucher, and the data

object type is definitely not assigned based on the type of multimedia content contained within the data object type. Brotz and Lambert also fail to supply that which Boucher lacks, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies solely on Boucher as disclosing the limitations of former dependent claims 7 and 8 (*see* Office Action mailed October 23, 2006, page 6).

In view of the above, it is clear that amended independent claims 1 and 15 are patentable over Boucher, Brotz, and Lambert, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claims 4 and 9-10 are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boucher, Brotz, Lambert, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,899,299 ("MacPhail"). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Boucher, Brotz, and Lambert fail to disclose all of the limitations of amended independent claim 1. Further, MacPhail fails to supply that which Boucher, Brotz, and Lambert lack, as evidenced by the fact that the Examiner relies on MacPhail solely for the purpose of disclosing affixing an arbitrary predetermined duration of validity to updated information (*see* Office Action mailed October 23, 2006, page 7).

In view of the above, it is clear that independent claim 1 is patentable over Boucher and MacPhail, whether considered separately or in combination. Dependent claim 6 is patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 11345/040001).

Dated: February 7, 2007   Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant